

Remarks

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 8-21, 30, 31, 33, and 35 are allowable and that claims 3 and 24 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of their base claims and intervening claims. Additionally, in the Office Action of September 20, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5-7, 22, 23, and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on U.S. Patent No. 6,667,993 to Lippett et al. (Lippett) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,680,970 to Mejia (Mejia) and U.S. Patent No. 5,446,765 to Leger ("Leger").

By this amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 22 to include features similar to those previously recited in claims 3 and 24, respectively. Claims 3 and 24 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 2 and 23 have been amended to improve form. Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 8-23, 26-31, 33, and 35 are currently pending.

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 22, 23, and 26-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Lippett, Mejia, and Leger. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Lippett and Mejia, the Examiner contends that Lippett discloses many of the features recited in this claim, but concedes that Lippett "does not explicitly teach using a clock signal having a phase determined based on edges in the serialized data." (Office Action, page 2). For this feature, the Examiner relies on Mejia. (Office Action, pages 2 and 3). Further, the Examiner relies on Leger to

disclose that a clock signal having a phase determined based on edges in serialized data that occur at least once every other cycle of the clock signal.

(Office Action, page 3).

In contrast to Lippett, Mejia, and Leger, amended claim 1 is directed to a communication method that includes receiving data from a first plurality of data lines, each data line providing data at a predetermined rate; serializing the received data; providing the serialized data over a link; deserializing the serialized data to create deserialized data using a clock signal having a phase determined based on edges in the serialized data that occur at least once every other cycle of the clock signal and that are generated by complimenting a first data line of the first plurality of data lines to obtain a second data line of the first plurality of data lines; and providing the deserialized data to a second plurality of data lines corresponding to the first plurality of data lines.

Applicants submit that Lippett, Mejia, and Leger do not disclose or suggest each of the features recited in claim 1. For example, none of these references disclose or suggest, as is recited in claim 1, “deserializing the serialized data to create deserialized data using a clock signal having a phase determined based on edges in the serialized data that occur at least once every other cycle of the clock signal and that are generated by complimenting a first data line of the first plurality of data lines to obtain a second data line of the first plurality of data lines.” (emphasis added). A feature similar to this feature of claim 1 was previously recited in claim 3 (now canceled).

The Examiner concedes that Lippett and Mejia do not disclose or suggest aspects of the above-quoted feature of claim 1. (Office Action, pages 2 and 3). Leger also fails to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 1.

Leger is directed to recovering data and clock information from an encoded serial data stream. (Leger, Title). Leger discloses a number of techniques for encoding/decoding a data stream, such as “double toggle” (DT) encoding. (See Leger, col. 6, line 10 through col. 7, line 16). Nowhere, however, does Leger disclose or suggest, as is recited in amended claim 1, “deserialized data using a clock signal having a phase determined based on edges in the serialized data that occur at least once every other cycle of the clock signal and that are generated by complimenting a first data line of the first plurality of data lines to obtain a second data line of the first plurality of data lines.”

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that even if Lippett, Mejia, and Leger were combined as the Examiner suggests, the combination would still not disclose or suggest each of the features recited in claim 1. The rejections of claims 2 and 5-7 based on Lippett, Mejia and Leger should also be withdrawn, at least by virtue of the dependency of these claims from claim 1.

Independent claim 22 and its dependent claims 23 and 26-29 also stand rejected based on Mejia, Lippett, and Leger. Claim 22 was rejected by the Examiner based on rationale similar to that used in rejecting claim 1.

Amended claim 22 is directed to a communication system including means for receiving data from a first plurality of data lines, each data line providing data at a predetermined rate. The system of claim 22 further includes


means for serializing the received data, a circuit for transmitting the serialized data, and means for generating a clock signal based on the serialized data by synchronizing a phase of the clock signal based on edges in the serialized data that occur at least once every other cycle of the clock signal and that are generated by complimenting a first data line of the first plurality of data lines to obtain a second data line of the first plurality of data lines. Further, the system of claim 22 includes means for deserializing the serialized data using the clock signal to create deserialized data and means for providing the deserialized data to a second plurality of data lines.

Applicants submit that Lippett, Mejia, and Leger, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each feature of claim 22. For example, claim 22 recites means for generating a clock signal based on the serialized data by synchronizing a phase of the clock signal based on edges in the serialized data that occur at least once every other cycle of the clock signal and that are generated by complimenting a first data line of the first plurality of data lines to obtain a second data line of the first plurality of data lines. Based on rationale similar to that given above with regard to claim 1, Applicants submit that Leger does not disclose or suggest this feature of claim 22. Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 22 based on Lippett, Mejia and Leger is improper and should be withdrawn. The rejections of claims 23 and 25-29, at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 22, are also improper and should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
Harrity Snyder, L.L.P.

By: 
Brian E. Ledell
Reg. No. 42,784

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800

Date: December 20, 2005